UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MARYLAND NORTHERN DIVISION

Marvin Mullins,

Civil Action No.: 1:10-cv-263

Plaintiff,

v.

: **COMPLAINT**

National Asset Recovery Services, Inc.; and

DOES 1-10, inclusive,

Defendants.

For this Complaint, the Plaintiff, Marvin Mullins, by undersigned counsel, states as follows:

JURISDICTION

- 1. This action arises out of Defendants' repeated violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq. ("FDCPA"), and the invasions of Plaintiff's personal privacy by the Defendants and their agents in their illegal efforts to collect a consumer debt.
 - 2. Supplemental jurisdiction exists pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.
- 3. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), in that the Defendants transact business in this District and a substantial portion of the acts giving rise to this action occurred in this District.

PARTIES

4. The Plaintiff, Marvin Mullins ("Plaintiff"), is an adult individual residing in Jarrettsville, Maryland, and is a "consumer" as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).

- 5. The Defendant, National Asset Recovery Services, Inc. ("NARS"), is a Missouri business entity with an address of 16253 Swingley Ridge Road, Suite 300, Chesterfield, Missouri 63017, operating as a collection agency, and is a "debt collector" as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6).
- 6. Does 1-10 (the "Collectors") are individual collectors employed by NARS and whose identities are currently unknown to the Plaintiff. One or more of the Collectors may be joined as parties once their identities are disclosed through discovery.
 - 7. NARS at all times acted by and through one or more of the Collectors.

ALLEGATIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL COUNTS

A. The Debt

- 8. A financial obligation was incurred (the "Debt") to First Premier Bank (the "Creditor").
- 9. The Debt arose from services provided by the Creditor which were primarily for family, personal or household purposes and which meets the definition of a "debt" under 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(5).
- 10. The Debt was purchased, assigned or transferred to NARS for collection, or NARS was employed by the Creditor to collect the Debt.
- 11. The Defendants attempted to collect the Debt and, as such, engaged in "communications" as defined in 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(2).

B. Commercial Engages in Harassment and Abusive Tactics

- 12. The Defendants called the Plaintiff up to four times per day, seven days per week.
- 13. The Plaintiff informed the Defendants that he disputed the Debt, and that it was

unclear to him whether or not the Debt actually belonged to him, without having verification of the Debt. The Defendants continued attempting to collect the disputed Debt.

- 14. The Defendants failed to send any written correspondence to the Plaintiff, informing him of his right to dispute the Debt, or any other legal rights under state or federal law. Despite their failure to send the Plaintiff any written verification of the Debt, the Defendants continued their collection efforts against the Plaintiff.
- 15. The Defendants told the Plaintiff to "be a man" and to "grow a pair" in reference to his inability to pay the Debt.
 - 16. The Defendants contacted third parties regarding the Debt.

C. Plaintiff Suffered Actual Damages

17. The Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer actual damages as a result of the Defendants' unlawful conduct.

COUNT I

VIOLATIONS OF THE FDCPA 15 U.S.C. § 1692, ET SEQ.

- 18. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.
- 19. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692b(2) in that Defendants informed third parties of the nature of Plaintiff's debt and stated that the Plaintiff owed a debt.
- 20. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692c(b) in that Defendants communicated with individuals other than the Plaintiff, the Plaintiff's attorney, or a credit bureau.
 - 21. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(2) in that Defendants used

profane and abusive language when speaking with the consumer.

- 22. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(5) in that Defendants caused a phone to ring repeatedly and engaged the Plaintiff in telephone conversations, with the intent to annoy and harass.
- 23. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a)(1) in that Defendants failed to send the Plaintiff a validation notice stating the amount of the Debt.
- 24. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a)(2). in that Defendants failed to send the Plaintiff a validation notice stating the name of the original creditor to whom the Debt was owed.
- 25. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a)(3) in that Defendants failed to send the Plaintiff a validation notice stating the Plaintiff's right to dispute the Debt within thirty days.
- 26. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a)(4) in that Defendants failed to send the Plaintiff a validation notice informing the Plaintiff of a right to have verification and judgment mailed to the Plaintiff.
- 27. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a)(5) in that Defendants failed to send the Plaintiff a validation notice containing the name and address of the original creditor.
- 28. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(b) in that Defendants continued collection efforts even though the Debt had not been validated.
- 29. The foregoing acts and omissions of the Defendant constitute numerous and multiple violations of the FDCPA, including every one of the above-cited provisions.
 - 30. The Plaintiff is entitled to damages as a result of Defendant's violations.

COUNT II

<u>WIOLATIONS OF THE MARYLAND CONSUMER DEBT COLLECTION ACT</u> <u>MD. CODE COMM. LAW § 14-201, ET SEQ.</u>

- 31. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.
- 32. The Defendants are each individually a "collector" as defined under MD. Code Comm. Law § 14-201(b).
- 33. The debt is a "consumer transaction" as defined under MD. Code Comm. Law § 14-201(c).
- 34. The Defendants repeatedly contacted the Plaintiff with the intent to harass or abuse, in violation of MD. Code Comm. Law § 14-202(6).
- 35. The Plaintiff is entitled to damages proximately caused by the Defendants' violations.

COUNT III

INVASION OF PRIVACY BY INTRUSION UPON SECLUSION

- 36. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.
- 37. The *Restatement of Torts, Second*, § 652(b) defines intrusion upon seclusion as, "One who intentionally intrudes…upon the solitude or seclusion of another, or his private affairs or concerns, is subject to liability to the other for invasion of privacy, if the intrusion would be highly offensive to a reasonable person."
- 38. Maryland further recognizes the Plaintiff's right to be free from invasions of privacy, thus Defendants violated Maryland state law.

- 39. The Defendants intentionally intruded upon Plaintiff's right to privacy by continually harassing the Plaintiff with phone calls, despite having knowledge that the Debt was disputed by the Plaintiff.
- 40. The telephone calls made by the Defendants to the Plaintiff were so persistent and repeated with such frequency as to be considered "hounding the plaintiff" and "a substantial burden to her existence," thus satisfying the *Restatement of Torts, Second*, § 652(b) requirement for an invasion of privacy.
- 41. The conduct of the Defendants in engaging in the illegal collection activities resulted in multiple invasions of privacy in such a way as would be considered highly offensive to a reasonable person.
- 42. As a result of the intrusions and invasions, the Plaintiff is entitled to actual damages in an amount to be determined at trial from the Defendants.
- 43. All acts of the Defendants and its agents were committed with malice, intent, wantonness, and recklessness, and as such, the Defendants are subject to punitive damages.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against the Defendants:

- 1. Actual damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1) against the Defendants;
- 2. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A) against the Defendants;
- 3. Costs of litigation and reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to 15 U.S.C.§ 1692k(a)(3) against the Defendants;
- 4. Actual damages pursuant to MD. Code Comm. Law § 14-203;
- 5. Actual damages pursuant to MD. Ann. Code. Bus. Reg. § 7-401(b);

- 6. Actual damages from the Defendants for the all damages including emotional distress suffered as a result of the intentional, reckless, and/or negligent FDCPA violations and intentional, reckless, and/or negligent invasions of privacy in an amount to be determined at trial for the Plaintiff;
- 7. Punitive damages; and
- 8. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED ON ALL COUNTS

Dated: February 2, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By_/s/ Forrest E. Mays____

Forrest E. Mays (Bar No. 07510) 2341 N Forrest Drive, Suite 90 Annapolis, MD 21403 Telephone: (410) 267-6297 Facsimile: (410) 267-6234

Email: mayslaw@mac.com

MD Bar No. 07510

Of Counsel To LEMBERG & ASSOCIATES L.L.C. A Connecticut Law Firm

1100 Summer Street, 3rd Floor

Stamford, CT 06905

Telephone: (203) 653-2250 Facsimile: (877) 795-3666

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF